DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 327 022 EC 232 672

AUTHOR	Torres, Marcia; Askins, William
TITLE	D.S.E. Citywide Chapter 2 Special Projects, 1988-89. Final Evaluation Report. OREA Evaluation Section Report.
INSTITUTION	New York City Boa ' of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.
PUB DATE	May 90
NOTE	29p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Programs; Education Work Relationship; Employment Opportunities; Employment Services; High Schools; Individualized Education Programs; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Job Development; Knowledge Level; *Placement; Postsecondary Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; *Severe Disabilities; Teamwork; *Transitional Programs; *Urban Education; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 2; Individualized Transition Plans; New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

This report presents an evaluation of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, Chapter 2, Subprogram C, Special Projects program for the 1988-89 school year. The purpose of the program was to expand the knowledge and skills of job developers in placing severely handicapped students in appropriate occupational and adult service agency situations. It offered seven job developer workshops related to increasing occupational opportunities available to Specialized Instructional Environment (SIE) students, organized 10 ongoing development committees, assisted 42% of the job developers in creating transition teams in their schools, produced a draft of a Job Developer's Handbook, and effected a positive change in workshop participants' level of knowledge. The program was not successful in meeting objectives of providing turnkey training at the schools and enabling participants to develop Individualized Transition Plans. Program participants reported that the program was effective in helping to develop a consistent approach to facilitating and optimizing SIE students' transition into the work world. They commended the program for providing useful information, facilitating networking, and providing new resources. Participants suggested that workshops needed to provide more opportunities for discussion and should focus more directly on certain categories of students, students' transportation needs, and communication between developers of Individualized Education Programs and Individualized Transition Plans. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED327022

OREA Report

Evaluation Section Report

D.S.E. CITYWIDE
CHAPTER 2
SPECIAL PROJECTS

1988-89

EC232672

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert Ibis
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

John E. Schoener, Chief Administrator

May 1990

Evaluation Section Report

D.S.E. CITYWIDE
CHAPTER 2
SPECIAL PROJECTS

1988-89

Prepared by:

Marcia Torres
Evaluation Specialist

William Askins
Senior Consultant

Special Education Evaluation Unit
Ronald C. Miller, Evaluation Manager

New York City Board of Education
Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
Robert Tobias, Director

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Robert F. Wagner, Jr.
President

Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Gwendolyn C. Baker
Amalia V. Betanzos
Stephen R. Franse
James F. Regan
Edward L. Sadowsky
Members

Joseph A. Fernandez
Chancellor

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, age, handicapping condition, marital status, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact his or her Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws may also be directed to Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201; or to the Director, Office for Civil Rights, United States Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

1/1/90

D.S.E. CITYWIDE
CHAPTER 2
SPECIAL PROJECTS
1988-89

SUMMARY

The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (E.C.I.A.), Chapter 2, Subprogram C, Special Projects program for the 1988-89 school year was designed to expand the knowledge and skills of District 75/Citywide job developers so that after completing their education, they could more effectively place severely handicapped students in appropriate occupational and adult service agency situations. This report presents OREA's evaluation of the Chapter 2 program implemented in 1988-89.

The OREA evaluation provides a descriptive analysis of program implementation and a data analysis of four process and three outcome indicators to provide a measure of program success. OREA found that the program was fully implemented as planned. Respondents reported that the program was effective in helping District 75/Citywide staff develop a consistent approach to facilitating and optimizing Specialized Instructional Environment (SIE) program students' transition into the work world. Job developers uniformly commended the Chapter 2 program for providing useful information, facilitating networking, and providing new resources.

However, respondents suggested that workshops needed to provide more opportunities for discussion and that the program should focus more directly on the needs of SIE VII, VIII students and younger students. They also suggested that the program address the transportation needs of students and improve communication between developers of Individualized Education Programs (I.E.P.s) and Individualized Transition Plans (I.T.P.s). OREA's analysis also pointed to the need to develop materials to inform parents about the importance of their children's transition to the world of work and in that way expand parent participation. It was also clear that the program should continue its efforts to develop job coach training as a necessary component of the supported employment program.

The 1988-89 Chapter 2 program succeeded in meeting three out of four process indicators. It successfully offered a series of seven job developer workshops at which representatives of a variety of programs, institutions, and agencies provided training on a wide range of topics related to increasing the occupational opportunities available to SIE students. It successfully organized a total of ten ongoing development committees and an additional ad hoc coalition. It also succeeded in meeting the transition team goal in that 42 percent of the job developers created transition teams in their schools.

The program did not fully meet one process indicator: 85 percent, and not the stipulated 100 percent of respondents reported providing turnkey training at their schools.

The Chapter 2 program was successful at meeting two out of three outcome indicators. It produced a draft of the Job Developer's Handbook, and effected a positive change in workshop participants' level of knowledge (more than 90 percent of respondents reported a moderate or

significant increase in their level of knowledge). The program did not fully meet its Individualized Transition Plan (I.T.P.) objective that 70 percent of particpating job developers would be able to prepare an I.T.P.; only 50 percent of respondents reported that they were able to do so.

In sum, the Chapter 2 program successfully met five of seven process and outcome indicators. Based on the above findings, OREA makes the following recommendations.

- Expand the provision of travel skills to SIE students.
- Broaden the program's focus to address the needs of higher-functioning and younger students.
- Improve collaboration between District 75/Citywide staff who prepare student I.E.P.s and transition teams who prepare student I.T.P.s. If possible, include on transition teams members of the Committees on Special Education or produce materials which inform them more fully about the vocational needs of this population.
- Expand the participation of parents. Develop materials to inform parents about the importance of their children's transition process.
- Continue to develop the training of job coaches as a necessary component of a successful supported employment program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	3
III.	EVALUATION FINDINGS	7
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	20

I. INTRODUCTION

PROGRAM GOALS

This report presents OREA's evaluation of District 75's implementation of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (E.C.I.A.), Chapter 2, Subprogram C, Special Projects program for the 1988-89 school year. The program's goals were to expand the knowledge and skills of District 75 job developers so that they could more effectively place severely handicapped students attending Specialized Instructional Environment (SIE) classes in appropriate occupational and adult service agency settings after completing their education. The Chapter 2 1988-89 program design included a plan to develop a number of procedures for facilitating the entry of these students into the work world. The program's resources were focused on increasing services and training to District 75 personnel who would then provide students with improved instruction in the areas of independent living, work experience, job readiness skills, supported employment opportunities, and vocational training.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The program's objectives were the following.

- Three training workshops for job developers will be held during the school year.
- Each job developer will conduct a minimum of one workshop and establish a transition team at his local school.
- Job developers will generate Individual Transition Plans (I.T.P.s) for each of their students who is 15 years of age or older.
- Program staff will design a job development training packet for use in future program cycles.

PROGRAM MODEL

The Chapter 2 design for 1988-89 included three main components: training workshops for job developers, turnkey training for school teachers an administrators, and development committees. Workshop training was to be directed primarily to District 75 job developers, although guidance counsellors, teachers, and other school staff were also expected to participate. After receiving training, job developerswere to provide "turnkey" training to other personnel at their local schools.

Chapter 2 was also designed to establish procedures to ease thetransition of SIE students from the school environment to the workplace, and to ensre their optimal placement after graduation in competitive employment, sheltered workhop programs, or adult service agencies. Initial plans stipulated that four committees s established to determine these procedures: the Planning and Consultation, Traitional Process, Business/Advisory, and Job Development Training Packets Committee. Depending on its task, each committee was to be composed of Chapter 2 staff/job developers, District 75 administrative and site-based staff, and where appropriate, rpresentatives of businesses, institutions of higher education, adult service agencies, studetts, and parents. The Chapter 2 staff was to consist of a director who would be in chrge of program administration, and two teacher trainers who would be responsible for onducting the job developer workshops.

REPORT FORMAT

This report is organized as follows: Chapter II describes the evaluation methodology. Chapter III presents findings on implementation andoutcomes, and Chapter IV presents conclusions and recommendations.

II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

ORE/A collected qualitative data in order to generate a descriptive analysis of program implementation. ORE/A also selected seven outcome indicators based on the program design to provide a measure of program success. The following are the questions and outcome indicators addressed in the evaluation of the Chapter 2 program.

IMPLEMENTATION

Staffing

- Who was on the program staff?
- What were their responsibilities?

Activities

- What activities were conducted?
- What topics were covered at the job developer workshops?
- Who attended the workshops?
- How was turnkey training conducted?
- Who attended turnkey training?
- To what extent was turnkey training supported at the school level?
- Who participated in the development committees?
- To what extent were parents involved in the development committees?
- What were the major accomplishments of the development committees?

PROCESS AND OUTCOME INDICATORS

OREA used four process and three outcome indicators to determine success.

Process Indicators

- Did the program staff provide at least three job developer workshops?
- Did job developers create transition teams made up of relevant personnel at their school sites?
- Did each participating job developer conduct one turnkey training session?
- Did staff organize four development committees?

Outcome Indicators

- Did the program produce a job developer's handbook that provided guidelines for the newly expanded job developer's role?
- Were 75 percent of the job developers who attended workshops able to design an I.T.P. for each of their students over the age of 16 by June 30, 1992?
- Did the job developer workshops positively affect participants' level of knowledge?

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Sample

All participants in the last two job development workshops were included in the sample and were asked to fill out participant evaluation forms concerning the program. This population was selected because the participants had been relatively constant throughout the series of seven workshops (making it essentially a universal sample) and because OREA was interested in participants' comments about the program after they had attended as many workshops as possible.

OREA consultants also interviewed approximately ten percent of the workshop participants. They were selected to include those involved in a range of classroom

[illegible] During these interviews, consultants collected data concerning turnkey training. They also collected data about the development committees by informally observing one session of each committee deemed central to the ongoing development of the Chapter 3 program.

[illegible]

ORSA used three data collection instruments in its evaluation: a job developer questionnaire, a job developer interview guide, and a staff development participant evaluation form. The interview guide included primarily open-ended questions, whereas seven-point Likert scales were used in structured responses to the other two instruments. ORSA also used summaries of data derived from two instruments which the Chapter 3 staff had developed and administered in the first few workshop sessions.

ORSA employed the staff development evaluation form in order to obtain general information about workshop training as well as participants' reactions to the workshops. The job developer questionnaire was designed to collect specific information about the staff positions of participants, the student populations they served, the individual workshop sessions, and the turnkey training provided at school sites.

The job developer interview guide employed open-ended questions in order to elicit descriptions of the program's effect at school sites. It functioned as a semi-structured guide for interviewing job developers, agency representatives, Chapter 3 staff, and other individuals involved in the program.

ORSA staff also reviewed data summaries derived from job developers' evaluation forms and open-ended feedback sheets that Chapter 3 staff administered to participants in the first four workshops. These forms solicited specific suggestions for improving the

program, as well as general comments about workshop implementation.

Data Collection

OREA consultants distributed staff development forms at the sixth job developer's workshop, and 36 of the 44 job developers in attendance returned completed forms. With the assistance of the program director, OREA consultants sent out questionnaires to job developers before the seventh and last workshop session and collected them at that session. Twenty-six of these questionnaires were returned to OREA. OREA consultants informally observed two of the job developer workshops and observed one meeting each of the Transition, the Business Advisory, and the Planning/Consultation Committees. Consultants reviewed agendas, working papers, drafts, and final documents prepared by these committees. After completing their development committee observations, OREA consultants also conducted interviews with job developers, Chapter 2 staff, District 75 staff, and others involved with the program. A total of 15 people were interviewed, eight of whom were job developers.

Data Analysis

To answer questions about the program's effectiveness, OREA tallied responses, and calculated frequencies. To answer questions about program implementation, OREA evaluated findings based exclusively on responses generated by at least 10 percent of the respondents.

III. EVALUATION FINDINGS

IMPLEMENTATION

Staffing

The three positions originally planned for the Chapter 2 program staff were not filled. The program began with a director and one teacher trainer. However, by January the director went on maternity leave and the teacher trainer assumed the responsibility of directing the program with the aid of a staff developer who functioned as a teacher trainer. The new program director and teacher trainer were both licensed to teach special education in New York City. They had additional experience with handicapped children and specific knowledge and teaching experience in the areas of job-readiness skills, career awareness training, and vocational training.

Because Chapter 2 was completely revamped for the 1988-89 school year, staff responsibilities were extensive. Of central importance was the organization of the job developer workshops. Chapter 2 staff recruited speakers from a number of institutions including the Institute for Human Resource Development, the Mental Retardation Institute, Manhattan Psychiatric Center, and the International Center for the Disabled. In addition to workshop-related tasks, program staff members were also responsible for setting the focus and direction of the development committee meetings held throughout the year.

Activities

Program activities consisted of job developer workshops, which provided the basis for turnkey training, and development committees.

Job Developer Workshops. Chapter 2 staff organized seven job developer

workshops, one each month except February from October to May. Each workshop was a day-long session focusing on a topic designed to expand the roles and skills of the job developers and other staff who provided such services to students with severe handicaps. At each workshop, Chapter 2 teacher trainers presented a status report of the work of the development committees. Representatives of public and private agencies and organizations made presentations on a variety of topics, including the work of multi-disciplinary teams, parents and legal issues, the transition process/adult service agencies, potential jobs, social skills, job coaching, assessments, and school-based programs. Each workshop included time for structured and unstructured discussion so that job developers could raise issues with presenters and also learn what other job developers were doing.

The Chapter 2 job developer workshops provided training to District 75 job developers and other personnel with similar responsibilities at 57 District 75 sites and programs. Program staff originally anticipated that two participants from each of the 120 sites would attend. In practice, however, about 80 people attended at least one workshop during the program cycle, with attendance varying from 31 to 54 at each workshop. The lower-than-expected response may have been due to the fact that participation was voluntary.

Of the participants responding, nearly two-thirds identified themselves as job developers, job coaches, or work-study coordinators; one third as career education, vocational education, or work-study teachers; and the remaining few as guidance counsellors or assistant principals. Respondents reported serving all SIE program service categories except SIE IX and X. Most served SIEs II, V, and/or VII. The majority provided services at only one site. Several, however reported that they provided services

at up to five sites, and four reported serving between 11 and 16 sites.

Some job developers served as few as 20 students while others reported working with well over 200 students at several sites. The number of students served by each job developer depended on whether the job developer was employed full or part time, the number of target students at each site, and the amount of attention required by each student because of his or her specific vocational needs. Thus the Chapter 2 workshop series succeeded in providing training to the targeted population. Those trained in job developer workshops were, in turn, to create transition teams and deliver turnkey training in their schools.

Transition Teams. Forty-two percent (11) of the responding job developers reported that they had established transition teams with a wide range of representation at their schools. These teams were made up of classroom teachers, related service providers, guidance counsellors, parents, New York State's Office for Vocational Rehabilitation (O.V.R.) personnel, unit teachers, paraprofessionals, other administrative staff, and students. A few respondents reported that they had also worked with prospective employers, or representatives from other outside agencies including Young Adult Institute (Y.A.I.), the Association for the Help of Retired Citizens (A.H.R.C.), Helping Individuals Retain Employment (HIRE), the City University of New York (CUNY) Collaborative Employment Project, the Association for Children with Retarded Mental Development (A.C.R.M.D.), Job Path, and U.S. Social Security Administration (S.S.A.).

Turnkey Training. Eighty-five percent of the job developers ((22) who responded to OREA's questionnaire reported providing some form of turnkey training. These sessions were attended by school administrators, unit and classroom teachers, paraprofessionals, guidance counsellors, S.B.S.T. members, related service providers,

and social service agency representatives.

Nearly half of the job developers responding reported presenting their training as discussions rather than formal workshop sessions. Some job developers chose to take this impromptu approach because they felt they did not have full support from their school administrations or because they had small numbers of students at their sites.

Development Committees. The Chapter 2 teacher trainer coordinated the formation of the ten ongoing development committees which eventually became a part of the program. Though these committees were initiated by program staff, they later became more independent as committee members began to formulate specific goals and methods for each project. Although the program policy stipulated four committees, the need for several other committees became apparent and Chapter 2 staff developed six additional committees: central advisory, supported employment, funded programs and funding sources, assessment and curriculum, vocational options for the severely handicapped, and parent involvement committees.

Seven of the committees were staffed by the Chapter 2 teacher trainer and job developers. The Chapter 2 teacher trainer successfully recruited a wide range of individuals to participate in the remaining three committees (planning/consultation, job development training packets, and supported employment). Representatives of District 75, local schools, adult agencies, CUNY, and businesses as well as parents of SIE students, and SIE students themselves served on these committees. The most significant accomplishments of the development committees are described below.

The Planning/Consultation Committee acted as the central planning group of the Chapter 2 program. Members worked to define the focus of the project and make specific plans for next year's program. The Transition Process Committee developed a

draft of the Individualized Transitional Plan (I.T.P.) and guidelines for job developers to follow when creating a transition team at each school site. This committee was made up of about 20 members, including job developers, unit teachers, assistant principals, a supervisor of the HIRE/A.H.C.R. adult service agency, and one SIE student.

The committee also produced a comprehensive plan to facilitate the appropriate placement of SIE students upon graduation. The plan outlined the student information and documents required to expedite the transition process, including an assessment of the students' educational, psychological, social, medical, and intellectual status, and an indication of the kind of family support that would be necessary. The plan also stipulated that each student be evaluated with respect to their work readiness, i.e., functional academics, self-care, work-related and communications skills. This information would be useful to potential employers in assessing each student's individual strengths.

By the end of the program year, the Transition Process Committee developed specific goals for the following year. These goals were to establish a District 75 Transition Task Force to monitor school-based transition activities, explore funding sources, gather and disseminate relevant state and federal legislative information, and produce a status report on all program activities for District 75. The committee also resolved to maintain open channels of communication among schools, adult service agencies, and state and federal organizations.

The Job Development Training Packet Committee was staffed by District 75 staff and job developers. Its primary accomplishment was producing a draft of the Job Developer's Handbook which comprehensively described goals, responsibilities, and procedures for the expanded role of the job developers.

The Business Advisory Committee was made up of Chapter 2 staff and other

District 75 personnel from approximately ten school sites. The primary tasks of the committee were to generate a pool of prospective employers and to find ways to inform them of the vocational abilities and potential employability of SIE students. The committee also produced a promotional packet that provided employment information about SIE students, their job training and previous successful job placements, and the types of entry level jobs for which they were best suited. These packets were sent to a number of prospective employers. Finally, with the assistance of P.L. 89-313 staff, the committee produced a videotape, entitled "Partnerships," which was specially designed to emphasize SIE students' vocational abilities.

Although it was not one of the ten ongoing committees developed by the program during the 1988-89 school year, the creation of the ad hoc Coalition for Supported Employment represented an additional and significant accomplishment of the Chapter 2 program. It came about as a result of the teacher trainer recognizing the important role that job coaches play in the process of supported employment. This factor, in combination with the fact that no formal training program for job coaches existed in the New York City area, led the Chapter 2 staff to form this ad hoc coalition. The Coalition which was mae up of adult service agency representatives, employers, and the Chapter 2 teacher trainer, was to explore the development of a job coach curriculum for the CUNY system. As the school year progressed, Chapter 2 staff, in collaboration with representatives of the CUNY Graduate Center and several CUNY community colleges, designed a Job Coach Training Curriculum to be used by CUNY community colleges. The coalition developed a draft document, "The Job Coach Training Program Pilot Project," which included plans for a grant proposal that would pave the way for further development of the curriculum in 1989-90.

Parent Involvement. Another committee that emerged as the program developed was the parent involvement committee. This committee was formed by the Transition Process Committee to increase parent involvement in the transition process. Seventy seven percent of the job developers who responded to OREA's questionnaire and who produced I.T.P.s during the year reported that they had included parents on their transition teams. This finding supports the fact that the primary task of the Parent Involvement Committee, the expansion of parent participation in the transition process, was successfully accomplished. On the other hand, parents were minimally involved in the other Chapter 2 committees.

Participant Perceptions of Program Strengths and Weaknesses

All categories of participants found the Chapter 2 program to be effective in many areas. Job developers reported that the program effectively helped District 75 staff develop a consistent approach to the process of finding appropriate occupations for students after graduation. The pooling and expansion of resources, knowledge, and experience was welcomed by virtually all job developer respondents. They found the workshops to be very valuable in providing information that helped them expand the parameters of their work with students. They reported that the workshops also served to reinforce ongoing activities.

Representatives of adult service agencies, which received many SIE students after they had completed their education, reported that the program was transforming the process of providing services and markedly improving students' chances of finding optimal placements.

All interviewees commented that workshops had been very valuable for

"networking" with others using comparable or innovative approaches. Many interview and survey respondents stated that the general discussions were the most valuable part of the workshops and suggested that more time be devoted to this purpose.

Some job developers who served higher functioning populations or younger students stated that because the program focused on teenage students with moderate to severe handicaps, it devoted little attention to the specific needs of younger or SIE VII and VIII students. They were particularly concerned about the latter group because these students constitute 20 percent of the District 75 population. Although many of them are relatively high functioning, employers perceive them to be the least desirable because of their behavioral problems. Job developers working with these students said the program should focus more consistently on their needs.

Respondents felt that developing students' travel skills and providing transportation for them to and from their jobs were crucial because employers are reluctant to hire students without transportation. The few adult service agencies that do provide transportation accept students only if they already have travel skills. Respondents felt this need was not adequately addressed by District 75.

Though not a reflection on the program, respondents reported that they frequently found the vocational information provided on student I.E.P.s inconsistent and inappropriate for preparing students for employment. Most respondents stated that coordination between the District 75 staff who prepare student I.E.P.s and the transition teams who design the I.T.P.s needed to be improved.

Finally, respondents reported that parents were often reluctant or afraid to let their children become more independent. This reluctance often resulted in less than enthusiastic parent participation in the development of the transitional plans. Given that

one of the Chapter 2 program goals was to help students become more self-sufficient, this is an important issue.

Summary

Chapter 2 was fully implemented as planned. Respondents reported that the program was effective in helping District 75 staff develop a consistent approach to facilitating and optimizing SIE students' transition process into the work world.

Program staff organized and carried out seven job developer workshops at which information was presented on a wide range of new and innovative approaches for preparing severely handicapped students to find appropriate occupations after completing their education. To the extent that respondents were critical of the workshops, it was because they felt the need for more discussion and the necessity to focus more on the needs of SIE VII and VIII and younger students.

The Chapter 2 program also succeeded in organizing ten ongoing development committees, six more than originally had been planned, as well as an ad hoc Coalition for Supported Employment.

In general, the program was especially effective in meeting its primary goal of providing relevant training to job developers. Job developers uniformly commended the Chapter 2 program in providing useful information, facilitating networking, and providing new and useful resources. Respondents did, however, suggest that it address the transportation needs of students, and improve communication between developers of I.E.P.s and I.T.P.s.

OUTCOMES

OREA designated four process indicators to determine the level of program

success: Did the program staff provide at least three job developer wrkshops? Did each participating job developer conduct one turnkey training sesion? Did job developers create transition teams made up of relevant personnel at the school sites? Did the staff organize four development committees?

OREA also specified three outcome indicators to assess the accomplishments of the program: Did the program produce a job developer's Handbook for the newly expanded job developer's role? Were 70 percent of the job developers attending workshops able to design an I.T.P. for each of their students over te age of 15 by June 30, 1989. Finally, did the job developer workshops positively affect articipants' level of knowledge? This section presents OREA's evaluation of the extnt to which the Chapter 2 program accomplished each of these indicators.

Process Indicators

Job Developer Workshops. Chapter 2 successfully organized an provided seven such workshops open to all District 75 job developers and other staffproviding similar services. This accomplishment clearly exceeded the workshop evaluion indicator.

Turnkey Training. Eighty-five percent of the job developers (22 who responded to OREA's questionnaire reported providing some form of turnkey traing. Given that the indicator for success was that all the job developers would providtturnkey training, this evaluation indicator was not fully met.

Transition Teams. These teams were made up of personnerepresenting al sectors of the school staff, as well as representatives from outsie agencies and businesses dedicated to facilitating employment for graduating handicapped students. About 42 percent of the job developers responding reported that they oranized transition

teams in their schools. Thus, this goal was met.

Development Committees. The program staff created the four development committees specified in the Chapter 2 design and also created six additional ongoing committees and an ad hoc committee based on the needs of the program as they became evident during the school year. Thus the program not only met, but exceeded its objective of organizing job development committees.

Outcome Indicators

Job Developer's Handbook. A draft of the Job Developers' Handbook was successfully completed, and the handbook will be available for use for the 1989-90 program cycle thus meeting the program goal.

Participant's Ability to Prepare an I.T.P. By May 29, the date of the last workshop, 90 percent (10) of the job developers who responded to ORE/A's questionnaire reported that they were able to produce I.T.P.s. With regard to the second part of the evaluation indicator, forty-two percent (11) of the responding job developers (11), reported that they had worked with transition teams at school sites to develop student I.T.P.s. Despite the 90 percent reporting being able to prepare an I.T.P., and approximately 42 percent reporting that they had established transition teams with a wide range of representation at their schools, the results fall short of the 70 percent evaluation indicator.

Workshop Participants' Level of Knowledge. In order to measure the impact of Chapter 2 workshop training on participants' level of knowledge, ORE/A consultants distributed surveys to participants in the last workshop of the series, asking them to estimate the degree to which their level of knowledge had changed as a result of their attendance. The results are presented in Table 1. Overall, 93 percent of the respondents

reported that their level of knowledge had considerably or significantly increased as a result of the Chapter 5 workshop series. More specifically, 48 percent of the respondents indicated that their level of knowledge had increased significantly as a result of their workshop attendance. Only about 7 percent of the respondents considered that their level of knowledge had been little affected.

Respondents rated the Transition Process/Adult Service Agencies, the Job Coaching, and the Assessments/School-Based Programs Workshops as the most informative, with more than half indicating that their level of knowledge had improved significantly as a result of their having attended the workshops.

TABLE 1

Change in Level of Knowledge
as a Result of Attending Chapter 1 Workshops
(in Percent)[1]

Workshop Topic	KNOWLEDGE GAINED			
	Little/ None	Moderate	Significant	Total
Multidisciplinary Teams	10 (2)	62 (11)	28 (7)	(20)
Parents and Legal Issues	10 (2)	61 (10)	29 (5)	(17)
Transition Process/Adult Service Agencies	4 (1)	44 (8)	52 (10)	(19)
Developing Jobs	5 (2)	60 (10)	35 (6)	(18)
Developing Social Skills	5 (2)	55 (10)	40 (11)	(23)
Job Coaching	4 (1)	52 (9)	44 (10)	(20)
Postsecondary/School-based Programs	3 (1)	50 (9)	47 (10)	(20)
Overall	7 (10)	55 (79)	38 (74)	(163)

Source: OREA-designed questionnaire

[1]Percentages may not total to 100 because of rounding.

- *More than 90 percent of respondents reported that their level of knowledge had moderately or significantly increased as a result of the workshops.*
- *Nearly 40 percent of respondents reported a significant increase in their level of knowledge as a result of the workshops.*

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

District 75's implementation of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (E.C.I.A.), Chapter 2, Subprogram C, Special Projects Program (Chapter 2) for the 1988-89 school year was designed to expand the knowledge and skills of District 75 job developers so that they could more effectively place severely handicapped students in appropriate occupational and adult service agency situations after their education was completed.

OREA found that the program was fully implemented as planned. Program staff organized and carried out the required activities. Respondents reported that the program was effective in helping District 75 staff develop a consistent approach to facilitating SIE students' transition to employment. Job developers uniformly commended the Chapter 2 program for providing useful information, facilitating networking, and providing new and useful resources. Respondents did suggest that workshops needed to provide more opportunities for discussion and that the program needed to focus more directly on the needs of SIE VII, VIII, and younger students. They also suggested that the program address the transportation needs of students and improve communication between developers of Individualized Education Programs (I.E.P.s) and Individualized Transition Plans (I.T.P.s).

OREA's analysis pointed to the need to develop materials informing parents about the importance of their children's transition process and in that way expand the participation of parents. It was also clear that the program should continue its work in the development of job coach training as a necessary component of the supported employment program.

During its first year of operation in its new form, the Chapter 2 program succeeded in meeting three out of the four objectives identified as process indicators. It successfully offered a series of seven job developer workshops at which representatives of a variety of programs, institutions, and agencies provided training on a wide range of topics related to increasing the occupational opportunities available to SIE students. The program also successfully organized a total of ten ongoing development committees as well as an additional ad hoc coalition. The program also met its transition team goal in that 42 percent of job developers reported organizing these teams. However, the program did not meet one process indicator: although 85 percent of the respondents reported providing either formal or informal turnkey training at their schools, not all reported doing so as had been originally intended.

The Chapter 2 program was successful in meeting two of the three outcome indicators. The Job Developer's Handbook was completed in draft form, and a positive change in knowledge was effected as a result of the workshop training. More than 90 percent of respondents reported a moderate or significant increase in their level of knowledge as a result of the series and nearly 50 percent of the respondents reported that their level of knowledge had increased significantly. However, The program did not meet the outcomes indicator regarding I.T.P. preparation. Approximately 50 percent of respondents reported having produced student I.T.P.s, whereas the indicator had been that 70 percent would be able to produce such plans.

Based on the above findings, OREA makes the following recommendations to the program.

- Expand the provision of travel skills to SIE students.

- Broaden the program's focus to address the needs of higher-functioning and younger students.

- Improve collaboration between District 75/Citywide staff who prepare student I.E.P.s and transition teams who prepare student I.T.P.s. If possible, include on transition teams members of the Committees on Special Education or produce materials which inform them more fully about the vocational needs of this population.

- Expand the participation of parents. Develop materials to inform parents about the importance of their children's transition process.

- Continue to develop the training of job coaches as a necessary component of a successful supported employment program.